arXiv:1511.03876v1 [math.OC] 12 Nov 2015

Flexible premium computation principles to manage prior information

Víctor Blanco*and José M. Pérez–Sánchez†

Dept. Quantitative Methods for Economics & Business
Universidad de Granada.

Abstract

We present in this paper a new computation principle based on the use of *prior* information from multiple sources for computing the premium charged to a policyholder. Under this framework, we propose alternative collective and Bayes premiums and describe some approaches to compute them. Several examples illustrates the new framework for premium computation.

1 Introduction

A Bonus–Malus System (BMS) is a merit rating method that is widely used by actuaries in non–life insurance, specially for automobile insurances (see [7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 18] for a brief overview of this topic). This rating method is based on the principle that the premium charged to a client or a portfolio of clients depends on the claims filed on the policy in the past. The BMS methodology is characterized by important penalties in case of claims and moderate premium discounts awarded to claim–free policyholders. Due to the nature of the problem it is common to apply Bayesian techniques to compute those premiums. In the Bayesian paradigm a *prior* distribution is used to quantify the knowledge about the unknown (a.k.a. risk) parameter, while in case data are available, the *prior* knowledge is updated using the likelihood function to give the *posterior* distribution.

One of the most usual techniques to compute BM premiums consists of minimizing certain expected losses that measure the deviation of the estimated risk parameter with respect to its actual value. This is performed by plugging in the risk into the distribution function of the number of claims. Several discrete (likelihood) distributions have been used in the literature to represent the number of claims: Poisson [12], Geometric [15], or Negative–Binomial [18], amongst others. On the other hand, the risk parameter is modeled by using different (*prior*) densities: Gamma, Pareto, Beta, etc. Hence, each of the combinations likelihood–*prior* distributions may result on different premiums, as they model different behaviors of the risk. The parameters of the *prior* distributions are provided by the expert's knowledge, while the *posterior* distribution also considers a sample of claims from the policyholders during a previous time horizon. A premium principle is a rule for assigning a premium to an insurance risk based on the experts' experience on the risk in the prior or in the prior–posterior sense).

*vblanco@ugr.es
†josemag@ugr.es

In actuarial literature it is usual to estimate the parameters of the *prior* distribution from a given sample. However, the Bayesian methodology assumes that such an information is provided by the expertise of an actuary. An expert should manifest some (sometimes partial) information about the behavior of the portfolio of policyholders in terms of claims. If this "experience" is not available, *prior knowledge* is estimated from a given sample. This estimation can be performed by different methods (method of moments, maximum likelihood, least squares, etc) and then, different results may be obtained for each of them. Hence, this information is not always unified and different experts may manifest different behaviors of the same risk. Furthermore, the information provided by the experts is not always precisely reported since they are usually asked to provide some approximate descriptive measures of the risk as the mean or the mode. This imprecision might imply, for large portfolios of policyholders, a considerable monetary gain or loss to the insurance company. In this paper, we deal with the problem of computing unified Bonus–Malus premiums when different experts give their opinion about the risk of a portfolio of policyholders. This new approach is based on aggregating the *prior* knowledge of all the experts on an unique loss function which is minimized to compute the premium. Such an aggregation criterion is based on the family of Ordered Weighted Averaging (OWA) operators.

OWA operators were introduced by Yager [19] as a flexible approach to aggregate functions in multicriteria decision making. They allow to model as particular cases the maximum, the mean, the minimum, the mean or the range of a finite set of values. In OWA aggregation, a vector of weights is given. The result is the linear combination of those weights with the ordered values, the first weight to the largest value, the second weight to the second largest value, etc. OWA operators have been applied in many different fields in order to generalize classical operators. They have been used to allow flexibility in many models and that combined with mathematical programming tools have been applied to generalize Linear Regression models [2], the Gini index [4], Location problems [17], among others.

Through this paper we provide mathematical programming formulations for managing different *prior* information sources for the construction of flexible Bonus–Malus Systems. The main differences of our approach with respect to the previous ones appeared in the literature are: (1) The premium assigned to a client depends not only of a single *prior* distribution but of several ones (one for each of the experts that give their opinion on the behavior of the portfolio); (2) a flexible family of choices for aggregating the *prior* information is provided to the actuary; and (3) an unified mathematical optimization framework is presented to compute the premiums to be loaded to the policyholders. Although not widely extended as it should, mathematical programming tools have been already applied in Risk Theory (see e.g., [5] or [9]).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall some of the definitions and results in net premium computation principles and OWA operators. Section 3 is devoted to introduce and state the main results of the new framework for computing risk premiums based on the use of several sources of *prior* information aggregated with OWA operators. Finally, Section 4 reports the results of some computational experiments performed in order to compare our approach with the classical methodology.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the main definitions that will be used through this paper. We recall some of the main premium computation principles and fix the notation for the rest of the sections.

Consider a policyholder, drawn randomly from the insurance portfolio, who is observed to have the sequence of independent and equidistributed claims, X_1, X_2, ... ,X_t, representing the performances of a single risk in the last t periods. A premium computation principle is a function $\mathcal{H}$, that maps to any risk a real number, the premium that should be charged for the

next period. Some properties are desired to be fulfilled by any premium calculation principle (see [6], [10], [11] and [20] for a detailed description).

A first attempt to compute the premium of a policyholder when no previous experience is known is the *risk premium*. For a given random variable X (number of claims) with density $f_\theta(x)$ for a given risk parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and a fixed loss function $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathcal{L}(P, x)$ is the loss incurred by a decision maker taking the action P (the premium paid by the policyholder) and facing the outcome x (the actual number of claims). The unknown risk premium is obtained by minimizing the expected loss under the risk distribution:

$$\text{RP} := \min_{P \in \mathbb{P}} L^R(P) = \int_x \mathcal{L}(P, x) f_\theta(x) dx = E\left[\mathcal{L}(P, x)\right], \tag{RP}$$

where $\mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{R}$, although the results in this paper extend to the case when $\mathbb{P}$ is a given interval. Also, we consider quadratic losses in the form:

$$\mathcal{L}(P, x) = (P - x)^2.$$

The premiums computed under this loss function are called *net premiums*. Under this principle, the risk function becomes:

$$L^R(P) = P^2 - 2PE[X] + E[X^2],$$

being its minimum attained at $P_R^* = E[X]$ with $L^R(P_R^*) = Var(X)$.

In Bayesian framework, the parameters of the risk distribution are unknown but distributed according to a *prior* distribution. In this setting, the *collective premium* is obtained by minimizing the expected loss (under the *prior* distribution) with respect to the actual risk premium:

$$\text{CP} := \min_{P \in \mathbb{P}} L^C(P) = \int_\theta \mathcal{L}(P, P(\theta))\pi(\theta) d\theta, \tag{CP}$$

where $P(\theta)$ is the risk premium when the parameter of the risk distribution is θ and π is the density function of the *prior* distribution.

Under the net premium principle (quadratic loss), we get that the collective risk function (to be minimized to obtain the premium) is:

$$L^C(P) = P^2 - 2PE_\pi[E_\theta[X]] + E_\pi[E_\theta[X]^2].$$

where $E_\theta[X]$ denotes the expected value of X with the (random) parameter θ. Note that for a given *prior* distribution π, its minimum is attained at $P_C^* = E_\pi[E_\theta[X]]$ with $L^C(P_C^*) = Var_\pi(E_\theta[X])$.

Finally, combining the *prior* information and the sample information $\mathbf{x}$ (*posterior* knowledge), a third premium, the so–called *Bayes premium* is computed as:

$$\text{BP}(\mathbf{x}) := \min_{P \in \mathbb{P}} L^B(P) = \int_\theta \mathcal{L}(P, P(\theta))\pi(\theta|\mathbf{x}) d\theta, \tag{BP}$$

where $\pi(\theta|\mathbf{x})$ is the density function of the *posterior* distribution obtained by applying Bayes' Theorem.

Again, for the quadratic loss, the Bayes risk function is:

$$L^B(P) = P^2 - 2PE_{\pi(\theta|x)}[E_\theta[X]] + E_{\pi(\theta|x)}[E_\theta[X]^2].$$

whose minimum is $P_B^* = E_{\pi(\theta|x)}[E_\theta[X]]$ with $L^B(P_B^*) = Var_{\pi(\theta|x)}(E_\theta[X])$.

We show in what follows a series of examples to illustrate the shape of the collective and Bayes risk functions for the most usual combinations of distributions in automobile insurance and that will be used in our experiments.

Example 1 (Poisson–Gamma)**.** *Let us consider a Poisson risk $X \sim f(x|\lambda)$ with a prior distribution Gamma, i.e., with density:*

$$\pi(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^{\alpha-1}\beta^{\alpha}\mathrm{e}^{-\beta\lambda}}{\Gamma(\alpha)}, \quad \lambda \geq 0,$$

for $\alpha, \beta > 0$. With this setting, the risk premium is $P_R^* = E[X] = \lambda$ and the collective and Bayes loss functions :

$$L^C(P) = P^2 - 2\frac{\alpha}{\beta}P + \frac{\alpha}{\beta}\left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}+1\right),$$
$$L^B(P) = P^2 - 2\frac{\alpha+t\overline{x}}{\beta+t}P + \frac{\alpha+t\overline{x}}{\beta+t}\left(\frac{\alpha+t\overline{x}}{\beta+t}+1\right),$$

when the posterior information for a given policyholder is $x_1, \ldots, x_t$. Thus, $P_C^* = \dfrac{\alpha}{\beta}$ and $P_B^* = \dfrac{\alpha+t\overline{x}}{\beta+t}$. Observe that $t\bar{x}$ is nothing but the overall number of claims of the policyholder during the time horizon.

Example 2 (Geometric–Beta)**.** *Let the number of claims be distributed under a Geometric distribution, whose probability mass functions is:*

$$f(x|\theta) = \theta\,(1-\theta)^x, \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{Z}_+,$$

being the random unknown parameter, θ, distributed as a Beta distribution with parameters α and β, that is,

$$\pi(\theta) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)}\theta^{\alpha-1}(1-\theta)^{\beta-1}, \quad 0 \leq \theta \leq 1.$$

(Note that θ represents the probability that the policyholder has no claims.)

The risk premium is $P_R^* = \dfrac{1-\theta}{\theta}$ (the mean of X), while the collective and Bayes loss functions are, respectively:

$$\mathcal{L}^C(P) = P^2 - 2\frac{\beta}{\alpha-1}P + \frac{(\beta+1)\beta}{(\alpha-1)(\alpha-2)},$$
$$\mathcal{L}^B(P) = P^2 - 2\frac{\beta+t\bar{x}}{\alpha+t-1}P + \frac{(\beta+t\bar{x}+1)(\beta+t\bar{x})}{(\alpha+t-1)(\alpha+t-2)}.$$

The Collective and Bayes premiums are then $P_C^* = \dfrac{\beta}{\alpha-1}$ and $P_B^* = \dfrac{\beta+t\bar{x}}{\alpha+t-1}$, respectively.

With the above definitions, Lemaire [12] defined the following Bonus–Malus premium (BMP):

$$\text{BPM} = 100\,\frac{P_B^*}{P_C^*}, \tag{BMP}$$

which represent the percentage overcharged of the individual premium with respect to the collective premium.

The collective and Bayes premiums are based on *prior* information provided by experts or previous experience. However, in practice, such an information is not completely objective

and different opinions may be needed to conform a more precise premium. Here, we propose a methodology to manage the *prior* information provided by different experts to compute premiums. These premiums will be calculated by minimizing an aggregation of the expected losses for each *prior* information. The aggregation will be performed using Ordered Weighted Averaging (OWA) operators. Let $f_1, \ldots, f_n : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, n real–valued mappings to be aggregated. For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the vector $\mathbf{f}(x) = (f_1(x), \ldots, f_n(x))$ is sorted in non–decreasing order, obtaining $(f_{\sigma(1)}(x), \ldots, f_{\sigma(n)}(x))$, for a permutation σ on the indices $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, such that $f_{\sigma(1)}(x) \geq \cdots \geq f_{\sigma(n)}(x)$. Then, for the given vector of weights $\omega = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the OWA aggregation function is defined as:

$$\mathrm{OWA}(\mathbf{f}; \omega) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i \; f_{\sigma(i)}(x),$$

where the i–th weight, ω_i is assigned to the value $f_{\sigma(i)}(x)$ which is in the i–th position when the vector $\mathbf{f}(x)$ is sorted in non–decreasing order. Note that, in case $\omega_i = 1$ for all i, the OWA operator coincides with the mean operator, while if $\omega_1 = 1$ and $\omega_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$, it coincides with the maximum operator. Table 1 shows some of the statistical measures that can be derived by specifying different weights to the OWA functions to aggregate the measures $z_1 = f_1(x), \ldots, z_n = f_n(x)$.

	ω	$\mathrm{OWA}(\mathbf{z}_i; \omega)$
Mean	$(\frac{1}{n}, \ldots, \frac{1}{n})$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_i$
Maximum	$(1, 0, \ldots, 0)$	$\max_{1\leq i\leq n} z_i$
Minimum	$(0, 0, \ldots, 1)$	$\min_{1\leq i\leq n} z_i$
Median	$(\overbrace{0, \ldots, 0}^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}, 1, 0, \ldots, 0)$	$\mathrm{median}\{z_1, \ldots, z_n\}$
K–Centrum	$(\overbrace{1, \ldots, 1}^{k}, 0, \ldots, 0)$	$\sum_{i=1}^{k} z_{(i)}$
anti K–Centrum	$(0, \ldots, 0, \overbrace{1, \ldots, 1}^{k})$	$\sum_{i=n-k+1}^{n} z_{(i)}$
(k_1, k_2)–Trimmed mean	$(\overbrace{0, \ldots, 0}^{k_1}, 1, \ldots, 1, \overbrace{0, \ldots, 0}^{k_2})$	$\sum_{i=k_1+1}^{n-k_2} z_{(i)}$
Range	$(1, 0, \cdots, 0, -1)$	$\max_{1\leq i\leq n} z_i - \min_{1\leq i\leq n} z_i$

Table 1: Some of the choices for the OWA operators.

3 OWA Bonus–Malus Systems

In this section we provide a general framework to deal with the problem of computing premiums when different sources of *prior* information are provided. Let X be a random variable, representing the number of claims for a given portfolio, with density $f_\theta(x)$, depending on an unknown risk parameter θ. We assume that n experts have provided *prior* knowledge about the risk. Hence, n *prior* densities $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_n$ are given to explain the behavior of θ.

If each single *prior* distribution is taken into account, one may has different collective (CP) and Bayes risk premiums (BP), one for each of the experts. However, different premiums cannot

be loaded to a single policyholder. In what follows, we describe how to handle with such an information, by taking into account all the experts' experience.

Let us denote by $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \ldots, c_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ each of the confidence level weights for each of the experts. Let us also denote by $\omega = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the OWA weights. We assume, w.l.o.g., that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i = 1$ and that $\omega_i \leq 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, we denote by L_i^C (resp. L_i^B) the collective (resp. Bayes) function for the ith expert, i.e.,

$$L_i^C(P) = P^2 - 2PE_{\pi_i}[E_\theta[X]] + E_{\pi_i}[E_\theta[X]^2],$$
$$L_i^B(P) = P^2 - 2PE_{\pi_i(\theta|x)}[E_\theta[X]] + E_{\pi_i(\theta|x)}[E_\theta[X]^2].$$

In these setting we introduce our flexible alternatives to collective and Bayes risk premiums as follows:

Definition 3 (Collective and Bayes OWA Premiums)**.**

- *The OWA Collective Premium is defined as:*

$$\mathrm{CP}_\omega \in \arg\min_{P \in \mathbb{P}} \mathrm{OWA}((c_1 L_1^C(P), \ldots, c_n L_n^C(P)), \omega). \qquad (\mathrm{CP}_\omega)$$

- *The OWA Bayes Premium is defined as:*

$$\mathrm{BP}_\omega(\mathbf{x}) \in \arg\min_{P \in \mathbb{P}} \mathrm{OWA}((c_1 L_1^B(P), \ldots, c_n L_n^B(P)), \omega). \qquad (\mathrm{BP}_\omega)$$

  where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_t)$ is a given sample of claims during the time horizon.

For the sake of simplicity, from now on, we will use the following notation for the OWA functions involved in the optimization problems of (CP_ω) and (BP_ω):

$$\mathcal{L}^C_{OWA}(P) = \mathrm{OWA}((c_1 L_1^C(P), \ldots, c_n L_n^C(P)), \omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \omega_{(i)} L_i^C(P),$$
$$\mathcal{L}^B_{OWA}(P) = \mathrm{OWA}((c_1 L_1^B(P), \ldots, c_n L_n^B(P)), \omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \omega_{(i)} L_i^B(P),$$

for any $P \in \mathbb{R}$.

Note that in the above collective and Bayes OWA Premiums the ω–weights are assigned to sorted losses while the $\mathbf{c}$–weights are assigned to experts. Then, the vector $\mathbf{c}$ indicates the information about the specific expert (as the confidence level) while the vector ω represents the principle assigned to sorted losses. Observe also that the objective functions of the problems that need to be minimized are, in general, not convex or differentiable functions, so the standard optimality conditions in such a framework cannot be applied.

Through this paper, we analyze both collective and Bayes premiums from a similar perspective because both loss functions have a similar structure. Then, unless necessary, for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we denote by $E_i[X]$ (resp. $E_i[X^2]$) the *prior* or *posterior* expectation (resp. second order moment) of X, which are part of the coefficients of the corresponding risk functions. Note that in the collective case, $E_i[X^p] = E_{\pi_i}[E_\theta[X]^p]$, while in the Bayes case, $E_i[X^p] = E_{\pi_i(\theta|x)}[E_\theta[X]^p]$, for $p = 1, 2$.

Remark 4. *The sum case ($\omega_i = 1$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$) is a very special case (the reader may observe that since all the ω weights are equal, no matter the sorted sequence of the losses). The overall loss function is*

$$\mathcal{L}^{\ell}_{OWA}(P) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i L_i^{\ell}(P),$$

for $\ell \in \{C, B\}$.

This function is convex and continuously differentiable. Hence, applying optimality conditions, we get that its minimum is attained at:

$$P^* = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i E_i[X],$$

that is, the **c***–weighted mean of the standard collective or Bayes premiums for each of the experts.*

In order to compute the OWA collective and Bayes premiums, for general ω weights, we first provide a mathematical programming formulation that allows to solve, using commercial solvers, the desired premiums.

Theorem 5. *The Collective and Bayes OWA premiums can be computed by solving the following mathematical programming problem:*

$$\min \sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j z_j \qquad \text{(OWAP)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
s.t. \quad & y_i \geq c_i\, L_i^{\ell}(P), && \forall i = 1, \ldots, n, && (1)\\
& y_i \leq z_j + M(1 - w_{ij}) && \forall i, j = 1, \ldots, n, && (2)\\
& z_j \geq z_{j+1}, && \forall j = 1, \ldots, n-1, && (3)\\
& y_i, z_i, P \geq 0, && \forall i = 1, \ldots, n, && (4)\\
& z_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, && \forall i, j = 1, \ldots, n. && (5)
\end{aligned}$$

with $\ell = C$ for the collective OWA premium and $\ell = B$ for the Bayes OWA premium and where $M > 0$ is a large enough constant.

Proof. Let P be a premium. Denote by y_i the marginal contribution of the ith–expert to the overall (aggregated loss), i.e., $y_i = c_i\, L_i^{\ell}(P)$ (constraint (1)). Let z_j denote the y–value which is sorted in jth position when sorted in non decreasing order and w_{ij} the binary variable that takes value 1 if $y_i = z_j$. Constraints (2) and (3) (and the minimization criterion) assure the well definition of these variables. □

Observe that constraints (1) are second order cone constraints, while (2) and (3) are linear constraints. Because some of the variables are required to be binary, the problem become a mixed integer second order cone optimization (MISOCO) problem, that can be solved by many of the available optimization commercial solvers (ILOG CPLEX, Gurobi, XPress, etc).

In some cases, the above formulation may be improved avoiding the binary variables, as in the case when $\omega_1 \leq \ldots \leq \omega_n$, which is refereed in the literature as the "convex case" (see [17]).

Theorem 6. *If $\omega_1 \leq \cdots \leq \omega_n$, then,* (OWAP) *is equivalent to the following continuous mathematical programming problem:*

$$\min \sum_{j=1}^{n} v_j + \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i$$
$$\begin{aligned} s.t.\ & y_i \geq c_i\, L_i^{\ell}(P), && \forall i = 1, \ldots, n, \\ & v_j + w_i \geq \omega_i L_j, \forall i, j = 1, \ldots, n, \\ & y_i, z_i \geq 0, v_i, w_i \in \mathbb{R}, \forall i = 1, \ldots, n, \\ & P \in R. \end{aligned}$$

for $\ell \in \{C, B\}$.

Proof. The proof follows by the representation of the ordering between the residuals by permutation variables, which for $0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n$, allows to write the objective function in (OWAP) as an assignment problem which is totally unimodular, so it can be equivalently rewritten using its dual problem. The interested reader is refereed to [1] for further details on this transformation. □

In the case when the ω–weights are nonnegative, the OWA (collective and Bayes) premiums can be, constructively, computed using finite search strategy. For the sake of obtaining such an approach, we first state some technical results that will be needed.

Lemma 7. *If* $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n \geq 0$*, then both* $\mathcal{L}^B$ *and* $\mathcal{L}^C$ *are piecewise convex functions.*

Proof. Note that the set of points where the risk functions of each of the experts change their sorting is finite. Hence, if we restrict optimizing $\mathcal{L}_{OWA}^{\ell}$ between two of those "breaking points" the function is a nonnegative linear combination of convex functions, then so is the function for $\ell \in \{C, B\}$. □

Let us now denote by $\mathcal{A}_0 = \{0 = p_0 \leq p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_k < p_{k+1} = p_k + 1\}$ the solutions of the equations $c_i L_i^{\ell}(P) = c_j L_j^{\ell}(P)$ for all $i < j,\ i, j = 1, \ldots, n$. Observe that $\mathcal{A}_0$ is the set of points where the change of ordering in the losses is possible. Let us denote by $I_j = (p_{j-1}, p_j)$ the open interval between two consecutive points in $\mathcal{A}_0$.

Lemma 8. *The function* $\mathcal{L}_{OWA}^{\ell}(P)$ *has at most one critical point in* I_j*, for all* $j = 1, \ldots, k$*,* $\ell \in \{C, B\}$.

Proof. The proof follows by noting that the function $\mathcal{L}_{OWA}^{\ell}(P)$, defined in the domain I_j, is a non–negative linear combination of convex functions. Thus, $\mathcal{L}_{OWA}^{\ell}(P)$ is convex in I_j. □

Note that at each of the intervals I_j, the losses for each of the experts are completely ordered. Hence, a single evaluation of a point inside the interval allows us to sort the losses of the experts and compute the ordered weighted sum $\mathcal{L}_{OWA}^{\ell}$.

Let us denote by $\mathcal{A}_\omega$ the set of critical points of L_{OWA}^{ℓ} inside all the open intervals, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{A}_\omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \{P^* \in \arg\min L_{OWA}^{\ell}(P) : P \in I_j\}$$

Observe that since $L_{OWA}^{\ell}(P)$ is strictly convex in I_j, those optimal solutions can be obtained by applying the standard optimality conditions over the closed intervals $cl(I_j)$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

We are now ready to state, from the comments and results above, the result that allows us to find efficiently the OWA premiums.

Theorem 9. *For any non–negative vector* ω *the set* $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_0 \cup \mathcal{A}_\omega$ *always contains the OWA premium.*

The reader may observe that the implication of the above theorem is that the optimal premium can be always obtained by a simple enumeration of the set $\mathcal{A}$. Thus, the worst-case complexity of the approach is $O(n^2)$ (the cardinality of $\mathcal{A}$). Algorithm 1 summarizes this overall procedure to compute the premiums.

Algorithm 1: Procedure to compute OWA premiums for $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n \geq 0$.

Data: Losses: $L_1^\ell, \ldots, L_n^\ell$; ω; c; $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$
for $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ $i < j$ **do**
  Compute the breaking points of each pair of expert's losses by solving
  $c_i \left(P^2 - 2E_i[X]P + E_i[X^2]\right) = c_j \left(P^2 - 2E_j[X]P + E_j[X^2]\right)$: $\mathcal{A}_0$.
end
Sort $\mathcal{A}_0 = \{p_0 = 0 \leq p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_k < p_k + 1\}$.
for $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ **do**
  Compute $x_j = \dfrac{p_{j-1} + p_j}{2}$.
  Sort $L_i^\ell(x_j)$ in nonincreasing order through a permutation of the indices σ.
  Set $\mathcal{L}_j^\ell(P) = \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i L_{\sigma(i)}^\ell(P)$.
  $\mathcal{A}_\omega = \mathcal{A}_\omega \cup \{\arg\min \mathcal{L}_j^\ell(P)\}$.
end
Output: $\mathcal{L}^* = \max\{\mathcal{L}_1^\ell(P_1), \ldots, \mathcal{L}_k^\ell(P_k)\} = \mathcal{L}_{j^*}^\ell(P_{j^*})$.
  $P^* = P_{j^*}$.

The following example illustrates the usage of the proposed algorithm.

Example 10. *Let us assume that three experts (with the same confidence level, i.e.,* $c = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$*) have manifested their opinion over a portfolio of policyholders. With such an information, we get that the collective risk functions for each of them are:*

$$L_1^C(P) = P^2 - 2P + 2,$$
$$L_2^C(P) = P^2 - 4P + 6,$$
$$L_3^C(P) = P^2 - 6P + 12.$$



Figure 1: Loss functions in Example 10 (L_1^C: dotted, L_2^C: dashed, L_3^C: black).

The three functions are drawn in Figure 1. Following the procedure described in Algorithm 1, first we get that $\mathcal{A}_0 = \{0, 2, 2.5, 3, 4\}$ *(the intersection of each pair of the above three curves and the extreme points* 0 *and* 4*).*

The second part of the algorithms needs to fix the ω*–weights. In Table 2 we show the results obtained for different choices of* ω*. In particular, we show the results obtained for the classical*

ω		$I_j=(p_j,p_{j+1})$	σ	$\mathcal{L}_{OWA}(P)$	P^*	$\mathcal{L}_{OWA}(P^*)$
SUM	$(1,1,1)$	$(0,2)$	$[3,2,1]$	$P^2-4P+\frac{20}{3}$	2	**2.7**
		$(2,2.5)$	$[3,1,2]$	$P^2-4P+\frac{20}{3}$	2	**2.7**
		$(2.5,3)$	$[1,3,2]$	$P^2-4P+\frac{20}{3}$	2.5	2.9
		$(3,4)$	$[1,2,3]$	$P^2-4P+\frac{20}{3}$	3.	3.7
MAX	$(1,0,0)$	$(0,2)$	$[1,2,3]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-2P+4$	2	1.3
		$(2,2.5)$	$[3,1,2]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-2P+4$	2.5	**1.1**
		$(2.5,3)$	$[1,3,2]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-\frac{2}{3}P+\frac{2}{3}$	2.5	**1.1**
		$(3,4)$	$[1,2,3]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-\frac{2}{3}P+\frac{2}{3}$	3.	1.7
MIN	$(0,0,1)$	$(0,2)$	$[3,2,1]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-\frac{2}{3}P+\frac{2}{3}$	1.	**0.33**
		$(2,2.5)$	$[3,1,2]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-\frac{4}{3}P+2$	2	0.67
		$(2.5,3)$	$[1,3,2]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-\frac{4}{3}P+2$	2.5	0.75
		$(3,4)$	$[1,2,3]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-2P+4$	3.	1.
akC	$(0,1,1)$	$(0,2)$	$[3,2,1]$	$\frac{2}{3}P^2-2P+\frac{8}{3}$	1.5	**1.2**
		$(2,2.5)$	$[3,1,2]$	$\frac{2}{3}P^2-2P+\frac{8}{3}$	2	1.3
		$(2.5,3)$	$[1,3,2]$	$\frac{2}{3}P^2-\frac{10}{3}P+6$	2.5	1.8
		$(3,4)$	$[1,2,3]$	$\frac{2}{3}P^2-\frac{10}{3}P+6$	3.	2
$\text{HURWICZ}_{0.5}$	$(0.5,0,0.5)$	$(0,2)$	$[3,2,1]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-\frac{4}{3}P+\frac{7}{3}$	2	1.
		$(2,2.5)$	$[3,1,2]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-\frac{5}{3}P+3$	2.5	**0.92**
		$(2.5,3)$	$[1,3,2]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-P+\frac{4}{3}$	2.5	**0.92**
		$(3,4)$	$[1,2,3]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-\frac{4}{3}P+\frac{7}{3}$	3.	1.3
$\text{HURWICZ}_{0.7}$	$(0.3,0,0.7)$	$(0,2)$	$[3,2,1]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-1.06P+1.66$	1.6	**0.81**
		$(2,2.5)$	$[3,1,2]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-1.53P+2.6$	2.3	0.84
		$(2.5,3)$	$[1,3,2]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-1.13P+1.6$	2.5	0.85
		$(3,4)$	$[1,2,3]$	$\frac{1}{3}P^2-1.6P+3$	3.	1.2

Table 2: Solutions for different choices of ω–weights in Example 10.

(weighted) SUM, MAXimum and MINimum criterions, the Anti K–center (aKC) criterion that minimizes the sum of the two smallest expected losses (obviating as outlier the largest one), and two cases of the Hurwicz criterion which minimizes the weighted sum of the maximum and the minimum losses (a weighted combination of the optimistic and the pessimistic principle). For each of the choices, the procedure consists of finding the minimum premium between each consecutive pair of elements in $\mathcal{A}_0$.

Table 2 shows the OWA choice (first two columns), the interval $I_j=(p_j,p_{j+1})$ where the order of the functions changes, the permutation σ that sorts in non decreasing order the losses at I_j, the aggregated expression of the loss function at each of the intervals I_j ($\mathcal{L}_{OWA}(P)$), the best premium at each of the intervals (P^*) and the approximate minimal value of the loss function at that premium ($\mathcal{L}_{OWA}(P^*)$). Numbers marked in bold face are the minimum values of the loss function, which allow us to select, accordingly, the premium. Observe that from Remark 4, the algorithm is not needed to be applied to the SUM case, but it is shown for illustrative purposes. Figure 2 shows the OWA loss functions.

In what follows, we explore some of the desirable properties which should be satisfied by a premium calculation principle. They are stated in the following result for the new principle:



Figure 2: OWA loss functions in Example 10.

Proposition 11. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ a premium principle derived from the above collective or Bayes premiums, then, for any risk X:*

1. *Risk loading: $\mathcal{H}(X) \geq E[X]$.*
2. *Maximal loss: $\mathcal{H}(X) \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup} X$.*
3. *Linear invariance: $\mathcal{H}(aX+b) = a\mathcal{H}(X) + b$, $a, b \geq 0$.*

Proof. We prove the result for the collective risk OWA premiums. The Bayes case follows in a similar way:

1. $\mathcal{H}(X) = \min_P \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{(i)}\omega_i L^C_{(i)}(P) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{(i)}\omega_i \min_{P_i} L^C_{(i)}(P_i) \geq E[X] \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{(i)}\omega_i \geq E[X]$.
2. $\mathcal{H}(X) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{(i)}\omega_i L^C_{(i)}(P) \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup} X \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{(i)}\omega_i \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup} X$.
3. Note that if p_{ij} is the intersection point between the curves $\mathcal{L}^C_i$ and $\mathcal{L}^C_j$ that conform the OWA function to be minimized, then, linear transformations of X in the form $aX+b$ produces intersection points in the form $ap_{ij}+b$. Furthermore, once the breakpoints are known, between those breakpoints one must minimize functions in the form $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_{\sigma(i)} c_i (P^2 - 2PE_{\pi_i}[E_\theta[X]] + E_{\pi_i}[E_\theta[X]^2])$, for some adequate permutation of the indices. Hence, the possible critical points are in the form:

$$P^* = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_{\sigma(i)} c_i E_{\pi_i}[E_\theta[X]]}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_{\sigma(i)} c_i}.$$

Performing the same operations for the forms $aX+b$, we get critical points $P' = aP^* + b$. Since for $a, b \geq 0$ the order does not change we get that, $\mathcal{H}(aX+b) = a\mathcal{H}(X) + b$.

□

Some of the standard properties of the premium computation principles are, in general, not verified. In the following example we illustrate a counterexample for the additivity of the premium.

Example 12. *Let us consider two independent risks X and Y distributed as $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mu)$, respectively. Let also assume that two experts (with the same confidence level) have manifested their opinion about the risks by giving these Gamma prior distributions:*

$$\lambda \sim \text{Gamma}(2, 10), \text{Gamma}(2, 20),$$
$$\mu \sim \text{Gamma}(3, 10), \text{Gamma}(7, 20).$$

Note that since the prior distribution become Gamma in this case, the collective risk functions for each of the experts and risks are:

$$\begin{aligned} X: L^C_1 &= P^2 - 0.40P + 0.24, \\ L^C_2 &= P^2 - 0.20P + 0.11, \\ Y: L^C_1 &= P^2 - 0.60P + 0.39, \\ L^C_2 &= P^2 - 0.70P + 0.4725. \end{aligned}$$



Figure 3: Loss functions in Example 12 (X, Y and $X+Y$ from the left to the right).

Hence, the OWA collective risks under the MAX criterion ($\omega = (1,0)$) are reached at $P_X^* = 0.2$ and $P_Y^* = 0.35$. On the other hand, by additivity of Poisson distributions and Gamma distributions (under the same β), we get that the collective risks functions for the risk $X+Y$ are, for each of the experts:

$$\begin{aligned} X+Y: L_1^C &= P^2 - P + 0.75, \\ L_2^C &= P^2 - 0.90P + 0.6525, \end{aligned}$$

and the OWA risk premium for the same weight is obtained at $P_{X+Y}^* = 0.5 \neq P_X^* + P_Y^* = 0.55$.

In Figure 3 we draw the loss functions for each of the risks X, Y and $X+Y$ under the maximum criterion, where we can check the obtained results.

Observe that the, in general, non additivity of the computation principle is reasonable from our construction of the premiums. An expert may express pessimistic opinion over a risk while the same expert may manifest optimism for another risk. Hence, there is no reason to think that if the addition of the two risk is performed, the best premium is obtained under the same sorting for both risks.

4 Experiments

In this section we report the results of a series of experiments in order to both show the behaviour of the new premiums and also illustrate the differences between the results obtained with our approach and those obtained with the standard approach. We consider six different choices for the ω–weights (see Table 3). We consider the following combinations of risk-prior distributions: Poisson-Gamma and Geometric-Beta (see Examples 1 and 2 for a description of the distributions). We compute (OWA) Bonus–Malus premiums for the time horizon $t = 0, \ldots, 4$ with number of claims ranging in $k = 0, \ldots, 4$. The parameters of the *prior* distributions were constructed as follows: experts #1 and #2 base their knowledge in the portfolios provided in [16] and [3], respectively; expert #3 is more conservative, being pessimistic about the driving of the policyholders; and expert #4 is slightly optimistic and less conservative. The *prior* parameters for each of the experts and for each of the Gamma and Beta distributions are showed in Table 4. They were computed by the maximum likelihood method.

In Tables 5 and 6 we show the Bonus–Malus premiums for the Poisson–Gamma combination. In Table 5 we report the results by applying the classical Lemaire's approach for each of the four experts. The reader may observe that expert #3 charges higher premiums to the "good" drivers (those with less number of claims) and lower premiums to the "bad" ones (those with higher number of claims) than other experts. This expert is, as expected, very conservative (recall that most of the policyholders are good drivers). On the other hand, expert #4 loads lowest premiums to good drivers and highest premiums to the clients with high number of claims. In Table 6 we show the OWA Bonus–Malus premiums. In this case, the highest "discounts" to

	ω
SUM	$(1, 1, 1, 1)$
MAX	$(1, 0, 0, 0)$
MIN	$(0, 0, 0, 1)$
akC	$(0, 0, 1, 1)$
$\text{HURWICZ}_{0.5}$	$(0.5, 0, 0, 0.5)$
$\text{HURWICZ}_{0.7}$	$(0.3, 0, 0, 0.7)$

Table 3: OWA weights for the experiments.

	Gamma(α_i, β_i)				Beta(α_i, β_i)			
Parameters	#1	#2	#3	#4	#1	#2	#3	#4
α_i	0.77	0.68	2.1	0.4	30.59	66.83	321.5	2.1
β_i	3.40	9.85	15	3.1	6.66	4.56	9.3	3.2

Table 4: Experts' beliefs for the experiments.

the good drivers are obtained with the MAX criterion (those clients not reporting any claim in its first contract year are loaded 22.70% less than their initial premium). On the other hand, the MIN criterion overloads bad drivers (those clients with 4 claims in the 4th period are charged 363.85% over their initial premium). The criterion for which the good drivers are more penalized is the akC criterion (the deduction from the first free–claim period is 7.23%). Observe that our approach smooths the pessimistic and optimistic information from the experts #3 and #4.

In Tables 7 and 8 we show the results for the Geometric–Beta combination of distributions. In the classical (single–expert) approach (Table 7), the discounts for good drivers are smaller than those obtained with the Poisson–Gamma distributions, except for expert #4 (optimistic) who charges lower premiums for all the policyholders. Table 8 shows the results of our approach. Similar to the Poisson–Gamma case, good drivers get better deductions with the MAX criterion. The same occurs with bad drivers obtaining the lowest penalties in the MAX criterium. In this case, the MIN criterion charges lower discounts to good drivers (observe the tiny deduction of 0.31% for a driver not reporting any claim in its first year). The akC criterion loads the largest premiums to bad drivers (66.46% for a driver with 4 claims in its 4th period). In general, premiums under the Geometric–Beta combination are lower, for bad drivers, than those obtained under the Poisson–Gamma combination.

A final observation from our experiments is that one may expect that the OWA operators constructed with the experience of a single expert (MIN or MAX), the Bonus–Malus premiums coincide with those computed for any of the single experts using the Lemaire's approach. However, this is not always true. Note that a Bonus–Malus premium is the ration between the Bayes and the collective premium. Both (absolute) premiums comes from the experience of a single expert. In case both come from the same expert, the Bonus–Malus is the standard Bonus–Malus premium of such an expert. Otherwise, if the collective is constructed from an expert and the Bayes from a different one, the Bonus–Malus premium does not coincide with any of the standard Lemaire's premiums.

Finally, the reader may observe from Tables 6 and 8 that the Bonus–Malus premiums give us information about percentage discounts or bonification, but not about the final income by the insurance company. Hence, the final return depends on the initial $(k = 0, t = 0)$ premium charged to the client. To get a financial equilibrium for all the OWA choices one should compute such an amount that, in general, differs for each of the criteria.

	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
EXPERT #1	0	100				
	1	77.3001	178.1350	278.9700	379.8049	480.6399
	2	62.9993	145.1794	227.3595	309.5396	391.7198
	3	53.1638	122.5139	191.8640	261.2141	330.5642
	4	45.9846	105.9698	165.9550	225.9401	285.9253
	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
EXPERT #2	0	100				
	1	90.7898	223.8571	356.9244	489.9917	623.0590
	2	83.1331	204.9783	326.8234	448.6686	570.5137
	3	76.6674	189.0360	301.4046	413.7732	526.1418
	4	71.1349	175.3946	279.6544	383.9142	488.1740
	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
EXPERT #3	0	100				
	1	93.7500	138.3929	183.0357	227.6786	272.3214
	2	88.2353	130.2521	172.2689	214.2857	256.3025
	3	83.3333	123.0159	162.6984	202.3810	242.0635
	4	78.9474	116.5414	154.1353	191.7293	229.3233
	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
EXPERT #4	0	100				
	1	75.6098	264.6341	453.6585	642.6829	831.7073
	2	60.7843	212.7451	364.7059	516.6667	668.6275
	3	50.8197	177.8689	304.9180	431.9672	559.0164
	4	43.6620	152.8169	261.9718	371.1268	480.2817

Table 5: Results for standard single–experts by using Lemaire's approach (Poisson–Gamma).

	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
SUM	0	100				
	1	82.6582	193.6878	304.7174	415.7470	526.7766
	2	71.2369	164.2918	257.3467	350.4016	443.4565
	3	63.0118	143.4898	223.9678	304.4458	384.9238
	4	56.7340	127.8561	198.9782	270.1003	341.2223
	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
MAX	0	100				
	1	77.3001	178.1350	264.2003	334.3071	399.4045
	2	62.9993	145.1794	222.7198	282.8075	336.5723
	3	53.1638	122.5139	191.8640	245.4111	293.9029
	4	45.9846	105.9698	165.9550	217.2575	262.4762
	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
MIN	0	100				
	1	90.7898	279.9272	370.2263	460.5253	550.8244
	2	83.1331	263.4609	348.4482	433.4356	518.4230
	3	76.6674	248.8242	329.0900	409.3559	489.6217
	4	71.1349	235.7281	311.7695	387.8108	463.8522
	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
akC	0	100				
	1	92.7707	166.6670	240.5633	314.4597	388.3560
	2	86.5473	154.9738	223.4002	291.8266	360.2530
	3	81.1280	144.8573	208.5866	272.3159	336.0452
	4	76.3628	136.0118	195.6608	255.3099	314.9589
	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
$\text{HURWICZ}_{0.5}$	0	100				
	1	83.6076	162.8964	242.1853	321.4742	412.0341
	2	72.6757	139.4557	206.2358	273.0159	349.6706
	3	47.3124	122.7064	180.6809	238.6553	303.5528
	4	41.8373	110.0233	161.4229	212.8225	264.2221
	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
$\text{HURWICZ}_{0.7}$	0	100				
	1	87.0387	154.6070	222.1753	289.7436	376.8512
	2	50.0346	136.3422	194.7450	253.1477	311.5505
	3	44.1294	122.8111	174.5975	226.3839	278.1703
	4	39.5812	112.2283	158.9576	205.6868	252.4160

Table 6: Experiments for Poisson–Gamma Bonus Malus by using OWA operators.

	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
EXPERT #1	0	100				
	1	96.7310	111.2515	125.7719	140.2924	154.8129
	2	93.6689	107.7297	121.7906	135.8514	149.9122
	3	90.7947	104.4241	118.0535	131.6829	145.3123
	4	88.0917	101.3153	114.5390	127.7626	140.9862
	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
EXPERT #2	0	100				
	1	98.5036	120.1234	141.7432	163.3630	184.9829
	2	97.0513	118.3524	139.6534	160.9545	182.2556
	3	95.6412	116.6328	137.6244	158.6160	179.6075
	4	94.2715	114.9625	135.6534	156.3444	177.0353
	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
EXPERT #3	0	100				
	1	99.6890	110.4082	121.1274	131.8467	142.5659
	2	99.3798	110.0658	120.7519	131.4379	142.1239
	3	99.0726	109.7256	120.3786	131.0316	141.6845
	4	98.7673	109.3875	120.0076	130.6278	141.2479
	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
EXPERT #4	0	100				
	1	52.3810	68.7500	85.1190	101.4881	117.8571
	2	35.4839	46.5726	57.6613	68.7500	79.8387
	3	26.8293	35.2134	43.5976	51.9817	60.3659
	4	21.5686	28.3088	35.0490	41.7892	48.5294

Table 7: Results for standard single–expert by using Lemaire's approach (Geometric–Beta).

	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
SUM	0	100				
	1	56.8821	73.1841	89.4861	105.7881	122.0902
	2	41.4282	52.9390	64.4497	75.9605	87.4713
	3	33.4063	42.4460	51.4858	60.5256	69.5654
	4	28.4515	35.9768	43.5022	51.0275	58.5528
MAX	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
	0	100				
	1	52.3810	68.7500	85.1190	101.4881	117.8571
	2	35.3471	43.5724	51.8126	60.0603	68.3125
	3	24.1558	29.7362	35.3300	40.9307	46.5353
	4	18.4232	22.6486	26.8868	31.1316	35.3801
MIN	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
	0	100				
	1	99.6890	110.4082	121.1274	131.8467	142.5659
	2	99.3798	110.0658	120.7519	131.4379	142.1239
	3	99.0726	109.7256	120.3786	131.0316	141.6845
	4	98.7673	109.3875	120.0076	130.6278	141.2479
akC	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
	0	100				
	1	98.8537	117.2536	135.6534	154.0533	172.4531
	2	97.7391	115.9046	134.0700	152.2355	170.4009
	3	96.6548	114.5925	132.5301	150.4677	168.4053
	4	95.5996	113.3157	131.0317	148.7478	166.4639
$\text{HURWICZ}_{0.5}$	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
	0	100				
	1	55.5666	71.8029	88.0392	104.2754	120.5117
	2	39.6633	50.9655	62.2677	73.5699	84.8721
	3	31.4239	40.1849	48.9458	57.7067	66.4676
	4	26.3470	33.5529	40.7588	47.9647	55.1706
$\text{HURWICZ}_{0.7}$	t \ k	0	1	2	3	4
	0	100				
	1	59.1645	75.2508	91.3371	107.4234	123.5097
	2	44.3836	55.9269	67.4702	79.0135	90.5568
	3	36.6131	45.7996	54.9860	64.1724	73.3589
	4	31.7437	39.4756	47.2074	54.9393	62.6712

Table 8: Experiments for Geometric–Beta Bonus Malus by using OWA operators.

5 Conclusions

We present a new family of flexible premium computation principles that allows to incorporate the beliefs of several experts in computing the collective and Bayes premiums. This allows to model different scenarios in calculating premiums: sum, pessimistic, optimistic, trimmed and some mixtures of pessimistic–optimistic cases. We present mathematical programming formulations to compute those premiums as well as a finite search algorithm that allows to compute efficiently the premiums for any choice of the elements in the new family of premiums computation principles.

We prove some properties of the premiums computed under this new framework and we run some computational experiments in order to illustrate the methodology and to compare the results with those obtained with the classical approach.

There are many possible extensions of this work. The use of severities of the claims, and then, dealing with the compound model is the natural first step. Also, the use of measures that allow to choose among the many possible choices of ω-weights would be a nice topic for further research. For the sake of that, one may first make the premiums comparable when computed with different approaches. Hence, budget-like constraints should be added to the mathematical programming problem that models the computation principle. Solving such a new model will not be never more possible using our finite search approach, and new algorithms should be developed.

Acknowledgements

The first author was partially supported by the projects FQM-5849 (Junta de Andalucía \ FEDER) and MTM2013-46962-C2-1-P (MICINN, Spain). The authors were also supported by the research group SEJ-534 (Junta de Andalucía).

References

[1] Blanco V., Puerto J. and El–Haj Ben–Ali S. (2014). *Revisiting several problems and algorithms in continuous location with ℓ_τ norms*. Computational Optimization and Applications, 58(3), 563–595.

[2] Blanco, V., Puerto, J. and Salmerón, R. (2015). *A general framework for multiple linear regression*. Submitted. Arxiv: http://arxiv.org/abs/1505.03451.

[3] Boucher, J.P., Dennuit, M. and Guillén, M. (2006). *Risk classification for claims counts: Zero–inflated mixed Poisson and hurdle models*. Working paper 06–06, Institut des Sciences Actuarielles, Universit Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve, Bélgica.

[4] Cardin, M. (2014). *A note on natural risk statistics, OWA operators and generalized gini functions.* Mathematical and Statistical Methods for Actuarial Sciences and Finance, 57–60.

[5] Carretero, R. and Sarabia, A. (2000). *Bonus–malus system in the fuzzy set theory*. IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems 2, 1033–1036.

[6] Gerber, H. (1979). *An introduction to Mathematical Risk Theory*. Huebner Foundation.

[7] Gómez, E.; Hernández, A.; Pérez, J.M. and Vázquez–Polo, F.J. (2002). *Measuring sensitivity in a bonus–malus system*. Insurance: Mathematics & Economics, 31, 105–113.

[8] Gómez–Déniz, E.; Vázquez–Polo, F.J. and Pérez, J.M. (2006). *A note on computing Bonus–Malus insurance premiums using a hierarchical Bayesian framework*. Test, 15 (2), 345–359.

[9] Gupta, A. and Li, L. (2007). *Integrating long–term care insurance purchase decisions with saving and investment for retirement*. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 41 (3), 362–381.

[10] Heilmann, W. (1989). *Decision theoretic foundations of credibility theory*. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 8, 77–95.

[11] Hrlimann, W. (1994). *A note on experience rating, reinsurance and premium principles*. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 14, 197–204.

[12] Lemaire, J. (1979). *How to define a bonus–malus system with an exponential utility function*. ASTIN Bulletin, 10 (3), 274–282.

[13] Lemaire, J. (1988). *Construction of the new Belgian motor third party tariff structure*. ASTIN Bulletin, 18 (1), 99–112.

[14] Lemaire, J. (1998). *Bonus–Malus system: the European and Asian approach to merit–rating (with discussion)*. North American Actuarial Journal, 2(1), 1–22.

[15] Mert, M. and Saykan, Y. (2005). *On a bonus malus system where the claim frequency distribution is geometric and the claim severity distribution is pareto*. Hacettepe Journal of Mathematics and Statistics, 34, 75–81.

[16] Morillo, I. and Bermúdez, L. (2003) Bonus–malus system using an exponential loss function with an Inverse Gaussian distribution. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 33, 1, 49–57.

[17] Nickel, S. and Puerto, J. (2005). *Location Theory: A Unified Approach*. Berlin, Springer.

[18] Shengwang, M., Wei, Y. and Whitmore, G.A. (1999). *Accounting for individual overdispersion in a Bonus–Malus system*. Astin Bulletin 29, 2, 327–337.

[19] Yager, R. R. (1988), *On ordered weighted averaging aggregation operators in multicriteria decision making*, Systems, Man and Cybernetics, IEEE Transactions, 18, 183–190.

[20] Young, V. (2004). *Premium principles*. In: *Encyclopedia of Actuarial Science*. John Wiley, New York.